

REMARKS

The present application includes pending claims 1-32, all of which have been rejected. By this Amendment, claims 1, 12, 23 and 28 have been amended. The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claim rejections.

Claims 1-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. In particular, the Office Action notes the independent claims recite “the limitation ‘the group of users’, however, ‘a group of users’ and a ‘self-administered group of users’ were defined in the claim, so the ‘group of users’ renders the claims vague and indefinite.” *See* January 4, 2008 Office Action at page 3. The Applicants have amended the independent claims to overcome this rejection.

Claims 1-7, 10-18, 21-25 and 28-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. 7,065,778 (“Lu”) in view of U.S. 7,055,104 (“Billmaier”). Claims 8, 9, 19, 20, 26, 27, 31 and 32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lu in view of Billmaier and U.S. 6,963,358 (“Cohen”). The Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for at least the reasons previously discussed during prosecution and the following:

I. The Proposed Combination Of Lu And Billmaier Does Not Render Claims 1-7, 10-18, 21-25 And 28-30 Unpatentable

Claim 1, as amended, recites the following:

A system providing search functionality to support the exchange and consumption of media **among a self-administered group of users administered by a member of the self-administered group of users**, the system comprising:

* * *

a first storage in the first home that stores the media; the first storage supporting consumption of the media by the first

television display, and having a first network protocol address associated with a first user;

* * *

a second storage supporting consumption of the media by the second television display in the second home, and having a second network protocol address associated with a second user; and

search software that receives a request comprising user defined search criteria and one of the first and second associated network protocol addresses, the first and second associated network protocol addresses representing members of the **self-administered group of users**, where the **self-administered group of users** is defined based on authorization by the **member of the self-administered group of the users**, and responds by identifying **media currently stored** on at least one of the first and second storage, the identified media matching the user defined search criteria.

On the other hand, Lu “relates to the field of utilizing personalized video recorders and other similar types of devices to distribute television programming.” *See* Lu at column 1, lines 7-11. In particular, Lu discloses a system in which a user is able to record a show that is transmitted in another broadcast area. *See id.* at Abstract.

For example, Lu describes the following:

Specifically, personalized video recorder 200 is coupled to the Internet 302 such that it can receive an electronic programming guide (EPG) containing worldwide television programming from an EPG server computer 304. The user of personalized video recorder 200 utilizes the EPG to request delivery of a specific television show that may not be available to him or her. Upon reception of the request from personalized video recorder 200, EPG server computer 304 locates via Internet 302 one or more personalized video recorders... situated within a broadcast region of the requested television show. Subsequently, EPG server computer 304 programs one or more personalized video recorders... to record the requested television show when it is broadcast by a television content provider.... Once the personalized video recorders... record the television show, one or

more of the personalized video recorders may transmit it to EPG server computer 304 which then transmits it to the requested personalized video recorder 200. In this manner, the present embodiment enables personalized video recorder 200 to order and receive specific television shows that are unavailable from its television content provider....

Lu at column 6, lines 39-61. Thus, Lu discloses a system in which a user sends a recording request that is received by a server computer via the Internet. The server computer then **arbitrarily** finds a recorder within the broadcast region of the show, and then sends the recorded show back to the requesting user. Lu merely discloses that a user of a PVR requests delivery of a specific television show, at which point a server computer arbitrarily locates another PVR in a particular broadcast area to record the show for the requesting PVR.

Lu does not describe, teach, or suggest, however, “A system providing search functionality to support the exchange and consumption of media **among a self-administered group of users administered by a member of the self-administered group of users,**” as recited in claim 1. Further, Lu does not describe, teach or suggest the first and second associated network protocol addresses representing members of the **self-administered group of users**, where the **self-administered group of users** is defined based on authorization by **the member of the self-administered group of the users**, and responds by identifying **media currently stored** on at least one of the first and second storage, the identified media matching the user defined search criteria,” as recited in claim 1, for example.

Indeed, the Office Action acknowledges that “Lu does not explicitly teach, wherein the group of users is administered by a member of the group of users and where the group of users is self-administered.” See January 4, 2008 Office Action at page 5. In an attempt to overcome this deficiency, the Office Action cites Billmaier. See *id.* at pages 5-6.

Billmaier “relates generally to the field of information systems [and m]ore specifically, ... to a system and method for focused navigation using filters.” *See* Billmaier at column 1, lines 7-10. Billmaier is directed to an Interactive Television System (ITV). Indeed, “FIG. 1 is a block diagram of an ITV system.” *See id.* at column 1, line 55. The ITV system 100 includes a TV 102, a set-top box (STB) 106 and a remote control 108. *See id.* at column 2, lines 39-42. As shown in Figure 1 of Billmaier, the ITV system 100 includes only one TV 102, STB 106 and remote control 108. That is, there is no network or group of such components at different locations.

The Office Action particularly cites Billmaier at Figure 1 and column 8, lines 63-67 as disclosing a “system providing search functionality to support the exchange and consumption of media **among a self-administered group of users administered by a member of the self-administered group of users**, the system comprising: . . . search software that receives a request comprising user defined search criteria and one of the first and second associated network protocol addresses, the first and second associated network protocol addresses representing members of the **self-administered group of users**, where the **self-administered group of users** is defined based on authorization by **the member of the self-administered group of the users**, and responds by identifying **media currently stored** on at least one of the first and second storage, the identified media matching the user defined search criteria.”

Figure 1 of Billmaier, as noted above, however, only shows and describes one user’s TV, STB and remote control. There is no group of users shown or described with respect to Figure 1.

Next, Billmaier at column 8, lines 63-67 recites the following:

Likewise, bringing the card 200i(videophone shape) into focus may result in a vertical sequence 300 of a videoconferencing

buddy list, while the card 200j (VCR shape) may display a vertical sequence 300 of television programs recorded by a PVR.

This portion of Billmaier merely discloses that a videoconferencing buddy list may be displayed. However, this portion of Billmaier merely notes the existence of a list of “videoconferencing buddies.” It is not, however, a self-administered group of users that is defined based on authorization by a member of that group. Indeed, there is nothing in Billmaier, nor Lu, that describes, teaches or suggests such features. That is, Billmaier, alone or in combination with Lu, does not describe, teach or suggest a “system providing search functionality to support the exchange and consumption of media **among a self-administered group of users administered by a member of the self-administered group of users**, the system comprising: . . . search software that receives a request comprising user defined search criteria and one of the first and second associated network protocol addresses, the first and second associated network protocol addresses representing members of the **self-administered group of users**, where the **self-administered group of users** is defined based on authorization by the **member of the self-administered group of the users**, and responds by identifying **media currently stored** on at least one of the first and second storage, the identified media matching the user defined search criteria,” as recited in claim 1. Independent claims 12, 23 and 28 recite similar limitations. Thus, for at least these reasons, the Applicants respectfully submit that the proposed combination of Lu and Billmaier does not render claims 1, 12, 23, 28 or the claims that depend therefrom unpatentable.

II. The Proposed Combination Of Lu, Billmaier And Cohen Does Not Render Claims 8, 9, 19, 20, 26, 27, 31 And 32 Unpatentable

The Applicants next turn to the rejection of claims 8, 9, 19, 20, 26, 27, 31 and 32 as being unpatentable over Lu in view of Billmaier and Cohen. The Applicants respectfully submit that this proposed combination of references does not render claims 8, 9, 19, 20, 26, and 27 unpatentable for at least the reason discussed above.

II. Conclusion

In general, the Office Action makes various statements regarding claims 1-32 and the cited references that are now moot in light of the above. Thus, the Applicants will not address such statements at the present time. However, the Applicants expressly reserve the right to challenge such statements in the future should the need arise (e.g., if such statement should become relevant by appearing in a rejection of a pending or future claim).

The Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are in condition for allowance for at least the reasons discussed above. If the Examiner has any questions or the Applicants can be of any assistance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney for Applicants. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any necessary fees, or credit any overpayment to the Deposit Account of McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Account No. 13-0017.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 1, 2008

MCANDREWS, HELD & MALLOY, LTD.
500 West Madison Street, 34th Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60661
Telephone: (312) 775-8000
Facsimile: (312) 775-8100

/Joseph M. Butscher/
Joseph M. Butscher
Registration No. 48,326
Attorney for Applicants